

**Alaskan Way Viaduct  
Summary of Public Comments  
November 13, 14, and 15 Open Houses**

**November 13, 2001**

**Do you see opportunities for improvements along the corridor?**

- Road surface smoothness
- Truck access
- Safety
- Aesthetics
- Waterfront access
- Parking along corridor
- Views
- More green space/parks
- Reduce noise
- Connectivity between neighborhoods
- Better on/off ramps
- Bicycle trails and pedestrian access
- Traffic congestion
- Accessibility

**What challenges do you anticipate the project will face?**

- Traffic during construction
- Cost
- Development paranoia
- Public distrust, especially involving transportation projects
- Noise
- Limited access to tourist activities along piers
- Public support
- Acquiring private property for project
- Project opposition
- Poor management
- Business interference during construction
- Length of project
- Environmental impacts
- Politics

**What issues are important to you? (1 – low and 5 – high)**

Noise – Average of 3.33 (70/21 = 3.33)

1 = 2

2 = 6

3 = 2

4 = 5

5 = 6

Aesthetics/views – Average of 3.95 (83/21 = 3.95)

1 = 1

2 = 1

3 = 5

4 = 5

5 = 9

Traffic during construction – Average of 3.57 (75/21 = 3.57)

1 = 3

2 = 1

3 = 5

4 = 5

5 = 7

Waterfront access – Average of 3.95 (83/21 = 3.95)

1 = 0

2 = 2

3 = 5

4 = 6

5 = 8

Access to downtown – Average of 3.95 (83/21 = 3.95)

1 = 1

2 = 1

3 = 6

4 = 3

5 = 10

Downtown mobility – Average of 3.81 (80/21 = 3.81)

1 = 1

2 = 1

3 = 5

4 = 8

5 = 6

Pedestrian/bicycle trails – Average of 3.38 (71/21 = 3.38)

1 = 3

2 = 4

3 = 4

4 = 2

5 = 8

Transit usage – Average of 3.33 (70/21 = 3.33)

1 = 3

2 = 5

3 = 3

4 = 2

5 = 8

**How many times a week do you use the viaduct? (Everyday, 4-5 trips, 2-3 trips, do not use)**

Everyday – 7 out of 20, 35%

4-5 trips – 1 out of 20, 5%

2-3 trips – 8 out of 20, 40%

Do not use – 4 out of 20, 20%

**Do you use it more to access or bypass downtown?**

Access – 4 out of 19, 21%

Bypass – 13 out of 19, 68%

Both – 2 out of 19, 11%

**What is your most significant concern about the viaduct's future?**

- Traffic congestion with no alternatives
- Safety
- That a new route be put in place before the old is removed
- Waterfront access
- Increase in vehicular use along corridor
- Future growth
- Views
- Urban design
- Aesthetics
- Bicycle and pedestrian access
- Getting the project done quickly
- Keeping it simple
- Regional connectivity

**What potential impacts should be considered by the project?**

- Traffic
- Waterfront businesses viability
- Waterfront access
- Views
- Pedestrian usage
- Development of land
- Noise
- Tourism
- Shoreline management
- Enhance property values along Alaskan Way, Pioneer Square and downtown
- Railroad and port interruption
- Urban housing improvements
- Environmental

**What are the three most important things to consider when deciding the viaduct's future?**

- Regional connectivity
- Desire to attract I-5 traffic
- Traffic flow

- Need for a second through route
- Urban design improvements
- Reducing traffic stress on I-5 and the port
- Developing city housing where existing structure is now
- Tourism
- Pedestrian access
- Noise mitigation
- Cost
- Full access to truck routes on Elliott and Aurora
- Views
- Waterfront access
- Transit
- Safety
- Future growth
- Aesthetics
- Seawall
- Length of project
- Quality of project
- Green space
- Parking
- Surface mobility
- Design

**You have seen three potential alternatives. Which of the three shows the most promise today?**

- #1) Bored tunnel – 1 out of 22, 4%
- #2) Cut and cover tunnel – 16 out of 22, 73 %
- #3) Elevated structure – 5 out of 22, 23

**Additional Comments:**

- Please up the load limits on the off ramps to 16,000 – 24,000. We pickup and delivery drivers used that very often until the 10,000 limits were imposed.
- Work to dispel fears of giveaway to condo developers. If there are redevelopment opportunities, pursue if the defray costs and widely publicize that. Include cost of seawall replacement in all alternatives so that cost compression is apples to apples (and thus value of cut and cover option is illustrated). If there's a good way to work in mass transit – whether monorail, light rail, BRT – definitely do it sooner rather than later.
- The option for incorporating the existing, dangerous and disruptive railroad tracks within the cut and cover tunnel should be explored. Provision for long distance rail/mass transit connecting at least Vancouver BC and Portland should be accommodated into the current tunnel when the costly and disruptive work is being done anyway.
- The potential design of the new tunnel should be based on the Elbe river tunnel in Seattle's potential sister city, Hamburg, Germany. Though it also was congested over 8 years ago (the last time I occasionally traveled with my kin on a trip) and/or based on the Eisenhower

tunnel on I-70 in Colorado up in the Rocky Mountains where I went through 2-3 times in my life.

- This is the single greatest urban design opportunity ever presented to the city. This is greater than how to get from point a to point b. Seattle will be one of the world's finest waterfront cities if this project is executed properly. Please keep the resultant urban streetscape at the forefront of your priority list. Incorporate high density housing into the plan to keep automobiles a necessity for urban worker... these issues is a solution in it's self to part of the problem.

**November 14, 2001**

**Do you see opportunities for improvements along the corridor?**

- Major north/south bike route that is safe and easy
- Improve the on/off ramps for merging into traffic
- Include a wide shoulder
- Transit improvement
- Seawall
- Stadium traffic
- Waterfront
- High bridge over current top deck
- Noise pollution
- Build more condo high-rises along waterfront with transportation access
- Access to and around downtown
- Urban design
- Safety
- Multi-modal transportation
- View
- Integration of monorail/passenger mobility with improved freight/container mobility
- Increase open space
- Bury road, add park
- Waterfront trolley access
- Keep trucks off viaduct
- Aesthetics

**What challenges do you anticipate the project will face?**

- Money
- Engineering difficulties
- Traffic during construction
- Future capacity
- Loss of scenic view
- Anticipation of future change – monorail, utility, etc.
- History of "Seattle" projects
- Politics
- Lack of vision
- Public support

- Aesthetics
- Project team staying focused
- Coming up with the right solution
- Long term safety
- Neighborhood opposition
- Fear of becoming the next Boston with the 'Big Dig'

**What issues are important to you? (1 – low and 5 – high)**

Noise – Average of 3.35 (134/40 = 3.35)

1 = 9

2 = 2

3 = 7

4 = 10

5 = 12

Aesthetics/Views – Average of 4.10 (172/42 = 4.10)

1 = 2

2 = 4

3 = 5

4 = 8

5 = 23

Traffic during construction – Average of 2.59 (106/41 = 2.59)

1 = 7

2 = 14

3 = 13

4 = 3

5 = 4

Waterfront access – Average of 3.88 (159/41 = 3.88)

1 = 4

2 = 4

3 = 6

4 = 6

5 = 21

Access to downtown – Average of 3.65 (157/43 = 3.65)

1 = 2

2 = 6

3 = 10

4 = 12

5 = 13

Downtown mobility – Average of 3.41 (143/42 = 3.41)

1 = 2

2 = 7

3 = 13

4 = 12

5 = 8

Pedestrian/bicycle trails – Average of 4.05 (166/41 = 4.05)

1 = 2

2 = 4

3 = 6

4 = 7

5 = 22

Transit usage – Average of 4.16 (179/43 = 4.16)

1 = 1

2 = 4

3 = 5

4 = 10

5 = 23

**How many times a week do you use the viaduct (everyday, 4-5 trips, 2-3 trips, do not use)?**

Everyday – 6 out of 40, 15%

2-3 trips – 26 out of 40, 65%

4-5 trips – 1 out of 40, 2.5%

Do not use – 7 out of 40, 17.5%

**What is your most significant concern about the viaduct's future?**

- Not having the viaduct
- Traffic during construction
- Safety and integrity of the existing viaduct
- Waterfront
- View
- Having a tunnel
- Fast traffic exit
- Transit
- Not being able to upgrade or expand it
- Seismic safety
- Lack of forward vision
- Making the same mistakes as in the past
- Long term benefit to the city
- Community involvement
- Loss of scenic highway
- Growth
- Loss of character and business viability
- Provide the functions it has today
- Not another aerial structure be built
- Funding
- Don't cut corners with spending

**What potential impacts should be considered by the project?**

- Traffic flow during construction
- Gridlock
- Environmental impacts
- Waterfront
- Noise
- Access
- Local businesses and residences
- Safety
- Increase property values
- Cost
- Seawall
- Construction
- Length of project
- Views
- Incorporate transit
- Growth in Belltown
- Access to ferry docks
- Aesthetics
- Pedestrian and bicycle friendly
- Dangerous on/off ramps
- Increased traffic on Alaskan Way

**What are the three most important things to consider when deciding the viaduct's future?**

- Bike and pedestrian trails
- Access to downtown
- Aesthetics/views
- Movement of people and goods, not vehicles
- Safety
- Waterfront use and access
- Noise
- Stadium access
- Costs
- Length of construction
- Accommodation for transportation and utility expansion and conversions
- Transit
- Build it to last
- Improve ferry/passenger access to CBD
- Grade separation of rail and truck freight traffic
- Increase length of trolley service
- Seawall
- Access to mid-town



- Separate truck traffic from cars
- Extend economic life of existing structure
- Urban design
- Add green-space
- Freight carrying capacity
- Improved access points/on and off ramps
- Future flexibility
- Speed up the process

**You have seen three potential alternatives. Which of the three shows the most promise today?**

#1) Bored tunnel – 4 out of 41, 10%

#2) Cut and cover tunnel – 26 out of 41, 63%

#3) Elevated structure – 7 out of 41, 17%

None/not sure/insufficient information – 4 out of 41, 10 %

**Additional Comments:**

- I wish a single high-level suspension bridge option had been included. Elevated option seemed to be as ugly as could be.
- It is possible that in 2030 our city's transportation may not be as car-focused as it is today. I hope the designers and planners of this project will consider that traffic predictions for 2030 are based on assumptions. The action of building a new viaduct will directly affect the future choices for transportation. Please take the time to consider that you may not only be serving a need, you may also have some power to shape that need. I commute now on the viaduct daily – my need is to get to work, not to drive my car.
- Evaluate an alternative using a toll tunnel for industrial traffic (buses, trucks, trailers) or for autos that want to pay toll for speed and bypass. This could be the seawall support. Retrofit or replace viaduct with another structure for cars only or cars and transit – no trucks.
- Potential alternative – particularly cut and cover – will greatly affect development of SAM Sculpture Park. Please work with and inform SAM as much as possible thru alternative selection and design process. Thanks!

**November 15, 2001**

**Do you see opportunities for improvements along the corridor?**

- Better access to downtown when coming from north end
- Improve access to downtown and waterfront
- Provide southbound access to SR 99 from West Seattle Bridge
- Improve access, traffic flow through, safety, and environmental/quality of life
- Add ramp to 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue for buses
- Add ramp to 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue South
- Add off ramp to Airport Way
- Have 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue ramp extended or improved
- Include transit, especially monorail.

- Add exit to stadium area
- Move trucks and containers from waterfront to I-90
- Improve corridor aesthetically
- Existing viaduct provides view and reduces stress of hectic life -- retrofit
- Eliminate barrier between city and waterfront
- Create open space along waterfront
- Become a more pedestrian and bicycle-friendly city
- Add bicycle path around Elliott Bay to connect with Myrtle Edwards Park
- Add access from downtown to north
- Add access from viaduct to midtown south bound
- Address Mercer Street and I-5 access at same time
- Improve handling of storm water runoff
- Additional capacity for future traffic
- Build a cable suspension bridge

**What challenges do you anticipate the project will face?**

- Budget
- Time to push through process
- Time to build structure
- Remaining accessible for the duration of the project
- Displacement of traffic
- Opposition from people who want no change
- Developers wanting airspace for hi-rise condos
- Reluctance to invest significant money in the future
- Political and public process
- Overcoming the engineers and architects love of tunnels regardless
- Distrust of "government" to resolve conflicting interests
- Funding
- Bad commute to downtown from W. Seattle
- Seawall
- Traffic during construction
- Safety – seismic standards
- Coordination
- Trust between community and government
- Trade disruption on the piers
- Taxes
- Keeping on schedule (budget and construction)
- Lack of creative thought

**What issues are important to you (1 – low and 5 – high)?**

Noise – Average of 2.42 (155/64 = 2.42)

1 = 20

2 = 16

3 = 15

4 = 7

5 = 6

Aesthetics/Views – Average of 3.68 (243/66 = 3.68)

1 = 7

2 = 10

3 = 10

4 = 9

5 = 30

Traffic during construction – Average of 4.12 (276/67 = 4.12)

1 = 3

2 = 6

3 = 9

4 = 11

5 = 38

Waterfront Access – Average of 3.34 (217/65 = 3.34)

1 = 8

2 = 10

3 = 16

4 = 14

5 = 17

Access to downtown – Average of 4.13 (289/70 = 4.13)

1 = 5

2 = 2

3 = 8

4 = 19

5 = 36

Downtown mobility – Average of 4.05 (259/64 = 4.05)

1 = 3

2 = 5

3 = 7

4 = 20

5 = 29

Pedestrian/bicycle trails – Average of 2.57 (162/63 = 2.57)

1 = 19

2 = 16

3 = 9

4 = 11

5 = 8

Transit usage – Average of 3.61 (242/67 = 3.61)

1 = 9

2 = 2

3 = 16

4 = 19

5 = 21

**How many times a week do you use the viaduct (everyday, 4-5 trips, 2-3 trips, do not use)?**

Everyday – 18 out of 66, 27%

4-5 trips – 19 out of 66, 29%

2-3 trips – 27 out of 66, 41%

Do not use – 2 out of 66, 3%

**Do you use it more to access or bypass downtown?**

Access – 23 out of 64, 36%

Bypass – 17 out of 64, 26.5%

Both – 24 out of 64, 37.5%

**What is your most significant concern about the viaduct's future?**

- Safety in an earthquake
- Maintain north/south alternative to I-5
- View
- It be preserved or retrofitted if not rebuilt
- Traffic during construction
- Project delay due to political process before catastrophe
- Failure of existing structure
- Aesthetics
- Don't cut corners with funding, spend what takes
- Connectivity to I-5 south of Midway and north of Northgate
- W. Seattle, Vashon and Southworth traffic not taken seriously enough
- Decisions will be made based on litigation rather than what makes sense for broad public
- Developers get the property and sell off the views
- 4-lane access to/from downtown
- Ease of access/bypass to north
- Safety in a tunnel during an earthquake
- Maintaining access to midtown
- Tunnel traffic needs to be separate from ferry traffic
- Tunnel options are ridiculous
- Distrust of developers
- The present viaduct is being undermined and not correctly evaluated
- Rebuilding the current viaduct with a slightly more palatable ugly viaduct
- Access will always be available
- Politics
- Cost
- Improvement of transportation routes

- Being eliminated completely
- Timing
- Loss of scenic highway
- No reduction in traffic capacity
- Build something to last
- A new viaduct should not have HOV lanes
- That the aerial option will be built
- That it won't have mass transit capabilities

**What potential impacts should be considered by the project?**

- Regional growth
- Puget Sound environment
- Maintaining traffic during construction
- Seawall
- Public transportation and non-personal vehicle transportation
- Public views going to development
- Public approval of project via 'vote'
- Public transportation options
- Cost
- Waterfront as a tourist attraction
- Access to Colman Dock
- Access to W. Seattle
- Alaskan Way businesses
- Noise
- Exit/entrances in logical slots
- Ferry dock and water taxi service
- Loss of transportation corridor
- All – only a suspension bridge addresses all in a positive way
- Aesthetics
- Economic disruption during construction

**What are the three most important things to consider when deciding the viaduct's future?**

- Safety
- Long-term solution
- Environmental impact
- Aesthetics
- Surface areas of the downtown waterfront
- Traffic on 1<sup>st</sup> Ave at game time
- Land fill liquidation
- No access to downtown
- Seawall inclusion
- Waterfront
- Length of project
- That is be above ground

- Traffic during construction
- Improvement of mobility between W. Seattle and Aurora and Battery
- Improvement of overall downtown traffic flow
- Listen to the desires of tax payers who will be paying for it
- Do the voters want it?
- Cost
- View
- Benefits
- Impacts
- Ability to expand and repair structure
- Knowing how many people need mid-town access
- Structural integrity
- Growth patterns of the waterfront
- Best dollar value – life cycle cost
- Don't fix what works now
- Staying away from developer's and politician's agendas
- Livability of the waterfront area
- Tourism
- Construction impacts to businesses and commuters
- Transportation needs of W Seattle and other key users
- Fit with monorail
- Handling of freight trucks south of the viaduct
- One on/off ramp
- Bypass downtown
- Access to both stadiums
- Increased capacity
- Port
- Build a waterfront pedestrian park with businesses
- Mass transit

**You have seen three potential alternatives. Which of the three shows the most promise today?**

- #1) Bored tunnel – 3 out of 61, 4%
- #2) Cut and cover tunnel - 25 out of 61, 41%
- #3) Elevated Structure – 32 out of 61, 52%
- None/need more time – 2 out of 61, 3%

\*One person answered more than one

#### **Additional Comments:**

- Please present this info with a presentation next time.
- Revise Purpose: Change #2 to: To maintain or improve mobility for people and goods along the existing SR99 corridor both during and after construction. Change #4 to: to maintain or improve areas...Change #5to: to comply with federal, state, and local regulations, policies, and procedures pertaining to growth, traffic, safety, etc. (The current purpose is inscrutable

and sounds loaded.) What about demolition plans/impacts? Please incorporate green building/demo practices (preferably into the Purpose).

- Is there some way portions can be built off site, such as bridges are constructed?
- The retrofit information seems lacking and skewed against it. It "may be less expensive to replace the viaduct" – it "may be" more expensive, too. By the time any new structure is built, it will no longer meet "current seismic design standards" – the standards change all the time.
- Run a floating bridge from Port of Seattle property on south end of viaduct to connect back to land at Broad St. Or connect back to exiting viaduct at Seneca. You may have to move the Ferry Terminal to achieve this and condemn Port of Seattle property.
- Your pictorial "Central waterfront Surface Roadway Conceptual Alternative with Viaduct" shows retail and maybe loft/low income housing? I'd like to see these things incorporated in to the design of a high level structure, if possible. These things could hold mitigate arguments of folks who want to see a lawn there.